

FEB 23 2004

Stephen E. Levick, M.D.
3 Narbrook Park
Narberth, PA 19072

Feb. 21, 2004

Dr. Joshua Lederberg
The Rockefeller University
2-11268-238
1230 York Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10021-6399

Dear Dr. Lederberg,

Thanks for sharing your preliminary thoughts about *Clone Being*. I hope the book lives up to your expectations.

Thanks also for the articles you enclosed. The piece in the *Washington Post* is as pertinent today as when you wrote it, bringing sense and science to a debate that still often goes nowhere. As you know all too well, there is no guarantee that what one says will necessarily make a difference, but one must try.

You're right in noting that I strongly emphasize that it is better to be linked genetically to two parents than to only one, and also why it is worse to be linked genetically to only one. I also fully agree that it is advantageous for an individual to be embedded in a diversified genealogical network. Beyond this, it is also essential that individuals become linked to a wider community. For this to happen, parents must increasingly "let go" of their child as he or she matures. We might expect that this would be more difficult for a parent of a self-clone to do.

Chapters 7 and 8 are relevant to your ideas about dynasties. As to the prospect of cloned Bush's and others, I explain there, and in chapter 10, that we are already living with the results of "clone-like" processes in the psychological, social and political realms.

As to the rotifers – I've read and clipped news pieces from *Science* when they've appeared, and appreciate bringing Meselson's web site to my attention.

I've requested your son's thesis through interlibrary loan, and look forward to reading it.

Your notion of "euphenics" to enhance developmental outcomes is very sensible, including such basics as good parenting and education. But, if we conceive of these things as exerting their influence only through the phenotypic expression of an individual's inherited genome, others can logically argue that it would only be consistent with the euphenic goal of optimizing development to also "enhance" the genetic raw material -- from the very beginning. Of course, this simply turns "euphenics" into a euphemism for "eugenics." Protecting human freedom and dignity I think requires an explicit acknowledgement of the individual self as a unit not fully captured by current

concepts of genotype and phenotype. That's where religion has typically come in with static results or worse, and where I think psychology and the social sciences must become assertive.

I'd be privileged to hear your further thoughts about and related to *Clone Being* as you read it.

Sincerely,

Steve Levick